

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 808

EA 021 496

AUTHOR Berman, Edward H.
TITLE A Comparative Analysis of Educational Reform.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society (Cambridge, MA, March 31-April 2, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Comparative Analysis; Cross Cultural Studies; *Educational Change; Educational Objectives; Educational Quality; *Education Work Relationship; Elementary Secondary Education; *Foreign Countries; Political Power
IDENTIFIERS *Educational Restructuring

ABSTRACT

There are common threads that can be identified in the current wave of educational reform activities in many societies (Soviet Union, United States, United Kingdom, People's Republic of China, Spain, West Germany, France, and Japan). The first of these common themes is the need to refocus the educational system so that it can perform more efficiently its function of providing the requisite knowledge and appropriate work habits that will lead to increased worker productivity when students enter the labor force. A second theme involves the necessity for the state to bind the citizens to its larger goals more firmly than is currently the case. A third theme is personal interest or self-aggrandizement, particularly, politicians and/or interest groups that see educational reform as a potential vehicle to enhance their own positions. The fourth theme revolves around the term "ideology" and is in many ways related to the state's "legitimacy deficit." (17 endnotes) (SI)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED313808

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Edward H. Berman

University of Louisville

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Edward H.
Berman*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the Comparative and
International Education Society, Boston, March, 1989

EA 021 496

Nation-states undertake the reform of their educational systems for culturally specific reasons, reflecting perceived or real problems in the socio-economic and/or political fabric of their societies at the time that the reforms are initiated. Because educational systems and their attendant problems (and the necessity to address these on a periodic basis) are culture specific, an understanding of the dynamics of educational reform demands an in-depth investigation of the socio-economic, political, and cultural tensions operating at the time the reform is undertaken. Having said this, let me hasten to add that, while such investigation is central to an understanding of educational reform, it is not my intention to pursue such a direction in this paper.

My purpose here is rather to inquire, in a very preliminary manner, if there are common threads that can be identified in the current wave of educational reform activities that are taking place in so many societies.¹ Let me put this concern in the form of several questions: are the issues in such dissimilar societies as the USSR and the USA defined in such a manner that policymakers in each are led to posit the same, or similar, rationales and solutions for embarking on far-reaching educational reform efforts? Are there common concerns (for example, the nagging problem of low worker productivity) manifested in these two societies that lead each to engage in similar educational reforms efforts, despite the cultural specificity of the educational reform enterprise and the very marked differences characterizing the two systems? Are there

some general themes that we can identify that might help us to understand the rash of educational reform activity that is taking place in such diverse nation-states as the Soviet Union, France, China, the United States, West Germany, and the United Kingdom, only to mention those cases that are the best known and best documented? This paper will focus on the search for answers, however tentative, to these and related questions.

TOWARD A TYPOLOGY OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM

Several common themes are immediately salient when undertaking even a cursory examination of the reform efforts in the nations mentioned immediately above. While I shall discuss these separately for the sake of convenience and, hopefully, clarity, it should be noted that these categories frequently overlap and are not as discrete as my delimitation of them might suggest to the casual reader.

The most obvious of these common themes or categories is the need to refocus the educational system so that it can perform more efficiently its function of providing the requisite knowledge and appropriate work habits that will lead to increased worker productivity when students enter the labor force. A second theme involves the necessity for the state to bind the citizens to its larger goals more firmly than is currently the case. Much has been written in the last decade or so about the state's crisis of legitimacy, the steady erosion of popular support for its policies by increasingly large segments of the

population. One way to reduce this "legitimacy deficit," as it is sometimes called,² is to undertake social welfare activities that minimally give the appearance to the populace that the state's representatives (read, politicians or whatever group monopolizes the organs of government) are indeed concerned about their interests. Education is of course among the most prominent of these social welfare activities.

Two additional themes swirl around the various educational reform activities and deserve mention, although I am not certain that their impact on the reform process is as demonstrable as the two already noted. The first of these is personal interest or self-aggrandizement. In this category I would place those politicians and/or interest groups in the society that see the educational reform issue as a potential vehicle to enhance their own positions. The second theme revolves around the term ideology, a catch-all term to be sure, and one that is in many ways inextricably related to the state's "legitimacy deficit" noted above. I shall address each of these themes, particularly the initial two, in more detail in the material that follows.

The economic/productivity requisite

A few words each about four nation-states will illustrate the degree to which the enhancement of economic productivity has driven the educational reform efforts of the People's Republic of China, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States.

The Chinese educational system suffered significantly during the decade-long (1966-76) Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR). Schools were closed for extended periods, urban students set to the countryside to engage in "productive" manual labor, teachers and staff forced to endure various forms of humiliating (and sometimes deadly) abuse, standards for student promotion altered to favor those from the "appropriate" class background, knowledge that might contribute to societal modernization ridiculed in favor of the inculcation of politically-correct information. The school-age cohort of this period is sometimes referred to as the "lost generation," reflecting both the paucity and the low quality of its educational experiences.³

The accession to power in the late 1970s of Deng Xiaoping represented a victory for the faction that viewed the modernization of China's underdeveloped economy as paramount. The role assigned to formal education in facilitating this was clear. Indeed, the importance attached to the educational system as an engine of economic growth is epitomized by the inclusion of science and technology as one the Four Modernizations that are the focal points of the new regime's priorities.⁴ Education was viewed as so important to economic modernization that the regime negotiated agreements enabling Chinese students to study abroad, a step representing a radical departure from the xenophobia that characterized the period of the Cultural Revolution and, to a lesser extent, the period from 1949 to its onset in the mid-1960s.

Chinese education since the proclamation of the People's Republic in 1949 can be conveniently understood as a struggle between the proponents of "redness" on the one hand, and those of expertise on the other. The former, whose greatest strength was manifested during the GPCR, see the school's primary function as the inculcation of the appropriate ideology. The continuance of the state as currently organized, and the gains that this has brought to the people, is threatened if the schools fail in this paramount responsibility, they argue. The modernizers, on the other hand, do not discount the importance of ideology for the continuance of state legitimacy, but they argue that this must be subordinated to the school's role in educating students in such a way that they can contribute to the country's economic development. The Chinese educational system currently reflects the views of the Deng faction. There is no guarantee, however, that the school's current emphasis on education for economic development will remain paramount, given the fact that the Chinese educational system has regularly, and rapidly, been brought into line with the nation's prevailing ideology. But for the time being, at least, it is clear that the force driving Chinese educational reform is the belief that education is indispensable to economic growth.

The desire to increase economic productivity plays a central role in the current educational reform efforts in Britain. It has been clear since she formed her first Government in 1979 that Prime Minister Thatcher has been unhappy with the direction taken

by the nation's schools. Her concerns were partly based on ideological and political concerns, about which more below, but also grew out of her belief that the structure, organization, and administration of the educational system, especially at the post-secondary level, prevented it from addressing the pressing problem of Britain's lagging economy. It was during the general election campaign of 1987 that Mrs. Thatcher itemized her educational reform plan, and it was her subsequent victory that afforded her the opportunity to push ahead with its implementation.⁵

The Thatcher Government is unambiguous in its belief that the nation's universities are not only poorly managed, but are overstaffed with academic dilettantes who spend too much time on the ephemeral and too little focusing on practical problems that could strengthen the British economy. Several provisions contained in the 1988 Education Bill are designed to address this issue. The Government proposes the replacement of the University Grants Committee, which for much of this century played an important advisory role in the allocation of the Government's portion of the universities' budgets, by the Universities Funding Council. This latter, unlike its predecessor, will be controlled directly by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, who will appoint its members. The composition of the Council will reduce considerably the influence of academicians in the budget allocation process, while increasingly commensurately that of representatives drawn from the corporate and financial sectors.

It is envisioned that the previous system of grants made by the Government to individual universities will be replaced by a contract system, whereby universities will negotiate with potential funding agencies -- be these Government departments or commercial enterprises -- for services to be rendered. This more or less open competition will most probably have the effect of pitting one institution and/or department against another. It is also likely that the new Council will allocate its budget in a manner that encourages the creation of a two-tiered university system, one part of which stresses research while the other part does not.

This trend, carried to its logical conclusion, will result in the concentration of scarce research funds in a handful of "select" universities and departments, leaving the others to pursue their redefined missions from a significantly reduced resource base. Underlying this proposed realignment is the theory of "big science" that holds that the greatest return from intellectual endeavors derives from investment in a limited number of "centers of excellence," which in turn generate the bulk of scientific/academic knowledge. This theory is not supported by the British experience.⁶ It is, however, consonant with Thatcher's attempt to force the universities to make greater contributions to economic growth while focusing less on the non-productive aspects of the higher educational enterprise, defined by her Government as certain subjects in the arts and humanities.

The nagging problem of low worker productivity also featured prominently in the series of educational reforms promulgated in the Soviet Union during 1983 and 1984.⁷ Policy makers hope to reshape Soviet schools through an emphasis on polytechnization, especially at the secondary level. Specifically this means an effort to upgrade the secondary level vocational-technical schools, the PTUs, which traditionally have had low prestige and holding power, while simultaneously increasing their enrollments. One proposal would double the enrollments of the PTUs. The increased student cohorts would be drawn largely from the general education, or 11-year, schools, which officials feel do not contribute sufficiently to the production of skilled workers to fuel economic expansion. Additionally, it is proposed that students enrolled in the PTUs engage in some form of productive work, for which they should receive 50% of the adult wage. These efforts represent an attempt to infuse the PTUs with additional status, thereby increasing their holding power in an effort to reduce the skilled worker deficit.

Polytechnical education has been a feature of the Soviet school system since the Revolution. While ideological considerations have always partially explained this emphasis, numerous commentators have noted that the unabated shortage of skilled labor from that time to the present offers an even more powerful incentive for its incorporation into the curriculum. One observer noted a decade ago that "the manpower needs of the

national economy take precedence over all other considerations in educational policymaking in the U.S.S.R."⁸ Skilled manpower continues to be inadequate in the Soviet Union today. This is attributable to a number of factors, one being the declining birth rate, especially in the country's European republics. This shortage of potential students is compounded by the problem of outmoded machinery and training equipment and a shortage of skilled artisans available to teach in the schools.

Another aspect of the reform effort involves the incorporation of labor training programs into the general education (11-year) school. It is doubtful if this effort can succeed, since to do so would require 1) adding even more instruction time to an already very crowded school calendar, 2) identifying enough teachers to staff these newly created classrooms, and 3) overcoming deep-seated parental and student hostility to the incorporation of manual/vocational subjects into the secondary school that has always enjoyed the greatest prestige and from which students continue on to university. While it is premature to evaluate the degree of success of various aspects of Soviet educational reform efforts, it is clear that policy makers see their efforts as critical to the goal of improving national economic productivity.

The year 1983 also marked the beginning of educational reform efforts in the United States. The first and best-known of the reports calling for reshaping the nation's educational structure, A Nation at Risk, was issued by the Office of

Education and set the tone for subsequent discussions on the issue of school reform. No fewer than a dozen reports followed during the next year. The sponsorship of these several reports included government agencies such as the Office of Education and the National Science Board, major financial institutions and corporations acting independently or through their professional associations and consortia, and such foundations and non-profit organizations as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the College Board.⁹

The focus of the reports varied as did their sponsorship. Some examined the general state of public education, others focused on subject matter areas such as mathematics and science, while a third group concentrated on the importance of strengthening school-business relationships. To be sure, the reports' sponsorship and foci differed, but more striking perhaps were the commonalities that they shared. The one overarching issue that led this diverse group of sponsors to focus on the need for educational reform was clear: the once-dominant position of the United States in the world capitalist economy is threatened, and the schools must play a central role in reversing this trend. This issue in turn has set the boundaries within which most of the discussion concerning school reform has been conducted since 1983.

The reform of American education can be accomplished, according to the consensual view contained in several of the most influential reports, by several means. The first involves

concentrating school resources on particular academic subjects, specifically mathematics, the sciences, and technologically-based and applied areas, while at the same time identifying those students most likely to benefit from such a curriculum. The second thrust involves elimination of many of the schools' noncognitive "frill" subjects and reducing the emphasis on such ancillary responsibilities as social and racial integration and personal growth and development.

Responsibility for implementing the proposed reforms has been assumed at the state level, and many states are engaged in efforts to overhaul their educational systems in line with some of the proposed changes. Given the nature of the governance structure of American public education, this means that some states will enact more and some fewer of the recommended reforms. These differences notwithstanding however, it is clear that the motivating force behind these efforts is the concern to rejuvenate American education so that its role in contributing to economic growth can be enhanced.

The state legitimacy requisite

Numerous commentators have examined the state's "crisis of legitimacy" over the last several years. Most of these, particularly those associated with the Frankfurt school, have focused on the manifestations of this crisis in advanced capitalist societies. They argue that structural constraints embedded in the system of state capitalism effectively preclude

real changes or reforms in nations whose economies are organized along capitalist lines. Structurally-derived patterns of inequality and lack of opportunity are not amenable to the limited reform efforts that both characterize and are acceptable in such societies. These arguments are so well-known that they need no rehearsing here.¹⁰

Weiler has utilized the basic tenets of this position and have focused on the manner in which educational reform efforts in several locales have been used to reduce the "legitimacy deficit" of particular regimes.¹¹ The state needs the support or the minimal acquiescence of significant proportions of the population for its activities in order to sustain its legitimacy. State representatives regularly proclaim the initiation of programs that appeal to various segments of the population. Such proclamations are not of course always followed by tangible results. This rhetorical commitment to change is important, however, because it gives the impression that the state is concerned about the welfare of its citizens. Such expressed commitment helps to secure the consent of the populace for the continuance of the regime in power and its activities.

If the state had no means to win the voluntary consent of important segments of its population, it would have to fall back on the means of repression to gain (and sustain) its legitimacy. The necessity to rely on force or coercion is the last resort of state representatives, and is only employed when they have exhausted all possibilities of winning the people's voluntary

consent. To gain this consent, while simultaneously augmenting its legitimacy, state representatives undertake initiatives that give the appearance that the state is interested in its citizens' welfare. Changes in existing school arrangements frequently are used for this purpose. This is so because of the school's prominent role in status allocation in advanced capitalist societies as well as the fact that it is an institution with which large proportions of the population can identify.

There is little with which to disagree in this assessment. It can be argued, however, that the situation is hardly different when the focus is turned to socialist societies. To be sure, the school should not play as large a role in status allocation as it does in capitalist societies, that is, if socialist theory is not to be violated. The reality is of course frequently at odds with that theory, as we well know. Few would dispute the fact that greater prestige and job opportunities accrue to graduates of, say, Moscow State University or Beijing University than to graduates of their provincial counterparts. As in capitalist societies, the regimes in Moscow and Beijing are also aware of the necessity of making available social services and educational opportunities to insure their populations' continued acquiescence to their continued governance.

The governments in both Moscow and Beijing also understand that today their credibility, and to a certain degree their legitimacy, is dependent on further devolution of power to local authorities. To this end the Central Committee of China's

Communist Party passed an education law in May 1985 that, among other things, extended the period of basic (elementary/primary) education to nine years. This law also ratified what increasingly had become accepted practice throughout much the country: local initiative, control, and financial support for a plethora of different educational institutions. This document explicitly devolved more authority on local education committees. It will be difficult for the Beijing government to reverse this action in future if it wants to retain its legitimacy in the eyes of large numbers of local people who strongly identify with the educational initiatives undertaken in their communities.¹²

In a striking departure from traditional practice that concentrated all educational decision-making in a centralized ministry, a top Soviet party official recently called for the creation of local and regional councils of parents, teachers, and workers' representatives that would oversee school activities and make recommendations for improvements.¹³ This call should be understood as one educational manifestation of the policy of perestroika or restructuring, an important part of which involves the devolution of authority in economic and other matters to regional and local authorities. Party Secretary (now President) Gorbachev has pointed out explicitly that only such tangible actions can serve to convince the population that the calls for change emanating from Moscow are substantive rather than merely rhetorical.

Other recent changes in the Soviet system are equally

dramatic, and no less important for helping to shore up the government's legitimacy. One of these involves the attempt to loosen the grip of the Ministry of Education and the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, which heretofore have been the unchallenged arbiters in all matters pertaining to the school organization, curriculum and practice. A group of pedagogical reformers are vigorously advocating greater local autonomy in curricular issues and less direction from the center. But perhaps the greatest shock came in May 1988 when the State Committee on Education announced the cancellation of the national history examination that was about to be administered to the secondary school graduating class. The reason given was simple: too much "incorrect" information had been transmitted to the students through their textbooks, and the total approach to the study of history at this level needed to be reconceptualized.¹⁴

Let us turn once again to capitalist societies and note how a few of these use educational reform activities to reduce as much as possible their "legitimacy deficit." In his analysis of educational reform activities in the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States, Weiler posits a three-pronged strategy that these states adopt to compensate for this deficit.¹⁵ He refers to these as 1) the "legalization" or "judicialization" of educational policymaking through the increased utilization of the courts and legal procedures; 2) the use experiments in the educational reform process; and 3) the involvement of clients/members of the public in the planning and experimentation

surrounding the reform process. A very few words about each of these strategies will illustrate how educational reform issues frequently serve the interests of the state more than its citizens.

Weiler notes the increased involvement of the courts in the educational process both in West Germany and in the United States. There are of course important differences which characterize this judicial intervention in the two locales. These do not, however, preclude a similar outcome: reduction of authority over educational decision-making of the executive or administrative branch of government and a concomitant increase of educational authority in the courts. This helps to reduce the state's legitimacy deficit in several ways, according to this analysis. First, the judiciary is viewed as the most independent, effective, and least corrupt of the three branches of government, and it enjoys the greatest public esteem and legitimacy. Court-initiated decisions leading to changes in existing educational patterns are frequently criticized by particular segments of the population, but at the same time they are viewed as representing the opinions of an institution which, qua institution, is above reproach and seen as representing the interests of all citizens as best it can. Second, the judiciary has increasingly encouraged, sustained or augmented educational practices initiated by the two countries' legislative branches, thereby lending its prestige to the new educational forms. Since the courts are the least affected of the three branches of

government by the legitimacy deficit, their intervention in educational matters helps to reduce somewhat the state's overall crisis of legitimacy to a greater degree than could unilateral actions by the executive or legislative branches, whose legitimacy deficits are considerable.

Most educational systems in advanced capitalist societies have been the site of numerous experiments over the last several decades. These include efforts to introduce some form of comprehensive schooling in many European states and programs to consider the special educational needs of the children of "guest" workers in several locales. Curriculum innovations have featured prominently on both sides of the Atlantic. North Americans have given special attention to the issue of bilingualism, early childhood intervention strategies, and the educational problems of the handicapped. Some of these "reforms as experiments" have been successful, others decidedly less so. The introduction of experiments into the educational arena plays an important role in reducing the state's legitimacy deficit. First, the experiments are purported to be scientifically valid, rigorously controlled, and independently administered. Their supporters point to their non-partisan nature, while willingly deferring professional judgements concerning the experiments' efficiency until the completion of the trial period. The introduction of an experiment frequently serves to defuse potential political conflicts surrounding extant school practice. All parties are assured by state representatives that the

experiment will be initiated with no prior assumptions undergirding it, that it will be objectively conducted by independent experts, and that the previously proposed school practice, which led to political contentiousness, will not be introduced until the results of the experiment are available. The second major gain from this process derives from the state's reliance on outside "experts". The professional credibility of these latter serves to enhance the legitimacy of the educational reform/experimentation process while simultaneously imbuing the state that has sponsored it with increased legitimacy.

It is rather common practice, at least in some capitalist societies, to provide a forum for teachers, parents, and other interested observers to comment on proposed curriculum reforms. Such client participation, at least on the consultative level, is almost standard practice in many parts of the United States. The encouragement of such participation is a mechanism to increase the state's credibility in the eyes of its citizens, whose opinions are actively solicited. What is taught in school sometimes generates strong sentiments among directly affected parties, although it is noteworthy that state representatives frequently expend more energy to mollify disgruntled parents than they do to win over the teachers, who are at least as concerned about this issue as are the parents. It will be interesting in this context to follow events in England, where the recently-inaugurated educational reform initiates a broad curricular reform that reduces considerably the autonomy of local districts

and individual schools while centralizing the power over curriculum issues in the London-based Department of Education and Science. This change engendered considerable hostility among both teachers and parents when it was initially proposed. It remains to be seen if the Government will in future regret this departure from the normal practice that leads the state to search for ways to reduce, rather than to increase, its legitimacy deficit through the introduction of educational reforms with which particular segments of the population can identify or support.

In a more recent piece Weiler turns his focus to reform efforts in France, and his conclusions provide another example of state-directed educational reform activities undertaken for two main purposes: 1) increasing economic productivity, through enhanced scientific and technical education, and 2) reducing the state's legitimacy deficit.¹⁶ Apropos this latter point, he notes the contentiousness that has surrounded the school reform issue of late and the fact that the reforms proposed by a succession of ministers have not been enacted. Several reasons help to account for this sorry record: educational systems are notoriously slow to change because, among other things, of the inertial tendencies within the structure of the system and the vested interest groups that, covertly or overtly, align themselves against proposed changes. But the failure to implement the proposed reforms is not without its positive side, particularly for the state. France's "recourse to the

legitimizing potential of symbolic action becomes an important strategy," according to Weiler, "all the more so as the alternative of real change tends to be prohibitively difficult or politically highly inexpedient."¹⁷ To put this somewhat differently: the state increases its legitimacy even when its proposed reforms fail because it gives the appearance of activity on the educational issue, thereby mollify those critics demanding action while simultaneously disarming those opposing any.

Some Concluding Remarks

As noted at the paper's outset, it seems clear that it is the economic productivity imperative and the state's need to enhance its legitimacy that are the driving forces behind most of the educational reforms mentioned. At the same time I think that the role played by individual politicians and identifiable interest groups in encouraging (or blunting) the reform impetus deserves more attention than it has received to date. An informed discussion of this role necessitates an in-depth understanding of the politics of education in the several nations surveyed, a task that goes beyond the limited efforts in this paper. However, let me put forward several thoughts that illustrate how fruitful such an investigation might prove for those wanting to untangle the dynamics involved in educational reform efforts in different countries.

It has generally been common for education to take on a more partisan political shading in European nations than in the

United States. The traditionally close alliance linking the teachers' unions and the Labour Party in the United Kingdom provides one among several examples that could be cited. Indeed, some commentators have argued that a priority motivating Prime Minister Thatcher to embark on her wide-ranging educational reform effort derives from her determination to weaken those long-standing links, particularly in the major urban areas where they have been most pronounced. This desire has led in turn to efforts to reduce the power and influence of urban county councils, which traditionally have been controlled by the Labour Party and which in turn have exercised significant influence over the local educational system. This story is interesting in its own right, but a further analysis is somewhat tangential to the point I hope to make here. At this juncture we need to introduce the politicians and attempt to ascertain the reasons behind their activities.

Mrs. Thatcher's platform has been championed most vigorously perhaps by Kenneth Baker, the Secretary of State for Education and Science. Some would argue that this is as it should be and is to be expected. Others would, and have, argued that Mr. Baker's advocacy has far exceeded the normal expectations of party loyalty (even for a minister), support for his chief, or deep-rooted ideological proclivities. According to this view, Baker's efforts represent a thinly disguised effort to win kudos from all wings of his party that might be useful in his expected bid to succeed Mrs. Thatcher as head of the Conservative Party.

When the focus is shifted to the United States, Mr. Baker's role is assumed by William Bennett, formerly Secretary of Education in the Reagan administration and currently drug "czar" in Bush's. The argument mounted by supporters and detractors are similar to those heard in Britain. The former argue that Bennett was merely acting in concert with the requisites of his office and his ideological beliefs in supporting a particular direction for the educational reform movement. The latter, on the other hand, see in his advocacy an effort to utilize his national visibility to augment his political campaign to run for the United States Senate from the state of North Carolina within the next several years.

Similar arguments can be made when assessing the careers of the succession of ministers who have been responsible for educational reforms in France over the last decade or so. The major differences in the French case, of course, is the fact that the vagaries of domestic politics have precluded any of these people from achieving the tenure enjoyed by Messrs. Baker and Bennett, thereby reducing considerably their abilities to use their positions for self-aggrandizement.

Nor should such inquiry be limited to the role of individual -- or collectives of -- politicians in furthering the educational reform impetus. There are numerous other groups with vested interests in perpetuating educational reform activities. Numbered among these are teachers' and administrators' unions, civil servants staffing education ministries, corporations and

financial institutions, major foundations, private consultants who advise and write on educational issues, journalists, and educators responsible for the training of future teachers. It needs to be reiterated that I am not suggesting the same degree of influence for these individuals and/or groups in furthering the educational reform impetus as I am for the economic productivity or the state legitimacy factors. But I am arguing that a comprehensive assessment of the factors generating and sustaining educational reform activity in various locales would be incomplete if these subsidiary factors are not considered. Researchers should of course dismiss these factors if the evidence so warrants, but they can ignore them only at the peril of producing incomplete and possibly truncated analyses.

NOTES

1. The reforms proposed or undertaken in a number of societies are well-documented, including those in the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, and the People's Republic of China. Equally important, but lesser-known, experiments are underway in Spain and West Germany, to cite just two examples. Even the Japanese system, which observers in other societies, particularly the United States, frequently hold up as a model, is not without its critics and would-be reformers.

2. See, for example, Jürgen Habermas, Legitimation Crisis (Boston: Beacon Press, 1975); and Claus Offe, "Structural Problems of Capitalist States: Class Rule and the Political System," in Klaus Von Beyme (ed.), German Political Studies, vol. 1 (Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage, 1974): 137-147.

3. Details can be found in Ruth Hayhoe (ed.), Contemporary Chinese Education (White Plains, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1985); and John Hawkins, Education and Social Change in the People's Republic of China (New York: Praeger, 1983). Cf. Marianne Bastid, "L'argument économique dans les réformes de l'enseignement en Chine au XX^e siècle," Interchange, 19, (Fall/Winter), 1988: 19-31. This special issue, entitled "Educational Reform in China and the West," contains a number of articles pertinent to this discussion.

4. The other "Modernizations" include agriculture, industry, and national defense.

5. The debate surrounding the Bill's passage during the summer of 1988, and the events preceding it, were extensively covered in the professional and daily press. Representative articles can be found in the following publications during the period from January 1987 through August 1988: The Times Educational Supplement, The Observer, The Guardian, The Times Higher Educational Supplement. An overview of these events is the subject of Edward H. Berman, "England's Educational Revolution," Abstracts in International Education (in press).

6. A concise overview of the impact of this and related provisions in the Bill on British higher education can be found in Tony Becher and Maurice Kogan, Calling Britain's Universities to Account (London: Colophon Press Ltd., 1987).

7. For details: John Dunstan, "Soviet Education Beyond 1984: a commentary on the reform guidelines," Compare, 15 (2), 1985: 161-187; Delbert Long, Educational Reforms in the Soviet Union, (Comparative Education Center, SUNY, Buffalo, 1985); and Beatrice Beach Szekely, "The New Soviet Educational Reform," Comparative Education Review, 30, August 1986: 321-343.

8. Beatrice Beach Szekely, "Editor's Introduction," Soviet Education, 19, September 1977, p. 3.

9. There has been considerable discussion of the reform issue in the United States. For an overview, see The New Servants of Power: A Critique of the 1980s School Reform Movement, ed. Christine Shea, Ernest Kahane, and Peter Sola (Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press, 1988). Cf. Don Adams, Catherine Cornbleth, and David Plank, "Between Exhortation and Reform--Recent U.S. Experience with Educational Change," Interchange, 19, (Fall/Winter), 1988: 121-134.

10. See note 2 above. Also, T.W. Adorno and M. Horkheimer, Dialectic of Enlightenment (New York: Seabury Press, 1972); Ralph Miliband, The State in Capitalist Society (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1969); Claus Offe, "Theses on the Theory of the State," New German Critique, 6, Fall 1975; and James O'Connor, The Fiscal Crisis of the State (New York: St. Martins Press, 1973).

11. Hans N. Weiler, "Legalization, Expertise, and Participation: Strategies of Compensatory Legitimation in Educational Policy," Comparative Education Review, 27, June 1983: 259-277.

12. Chang Kai Ming, "China's Recent Educational Reform: the beginnings of an overhaul," Comparative Education, 22 (3), 1986: 235-269.

13. Felicity Barringer, "A Top Soviet Aide Calls for Change in School System," The New York Times, February 18, 1988, pp. 1, 17.

14. Esther B. Fein, "Soviet Pupils Spared Exams While History is Rewritten," The New York Times, May 31, 1988, pp. 1, 8.

15. See note 11 above. The following discussion is drawn from this source.

16. Hans N. Weiler, "The Politics of Reform and Nonreform in French Education," Comparative Education Review, 32, August 1988: 251-265.

17. Ibid., p. 265.